

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF GEORGIA  
STATESBORO DIVISION**

SALEEBAN ISSE ADAN,

Plaintiff,

v.

WARDEN S. WILLIAM, DR. NICCOLO,  
ROBERT TOOLE,

Defendants.

CIVIL ACTION NO.: 6:15-cv-58

**ORDER and MAGISTRATE JUDGE’S REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION**

Plaintiff, an inmate at Georgia State Prison in Reidsville, Georgia, filed this action pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983. In his Complaint, he contested certain conditions of his confinement. A prisoner proceeding in a civil action against officers or employees of government entities must comply with the mandates of the Prison Litigation Reform Act (“PLRA”), 28 U.S.C. § 1915. After review, the Court **VACATES** its Order dated June 12, 2015, (doc. 9), and **DENIES** Plaintiff’s Motion to Proceed *In Forma Pauperis*, (doc. 8). See McKenzie v. U.S. Dep’t of Justice, 143 Fed. Appx. 165 (11th Cir.2005) (district court may revisit earlier order allowing prisoner suit to proceed). It is also my **RECOMMENDATION** Plaintiff’s Complaint, (doc. 1), be **DISMISSED**, without prejudice, pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1915(g) and that Plaintiff be **DENIED** *in forma pauperis* status on appeal.<sup>1</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> A “district court can only dismiss an action on its own motion as long as the procedure employed is fair. . . . To employ fair procedure, a district court must generally provide the plaintiff with notice of its intent to dismiss or an opportunity to respond.” Tazoe v. Airbus S.A.S., 631 F.3d 1321, 1336 (11th Cir. 2011) (citations and internal quotations marks omitted). A Magistrate Judge’s Report and Recommendation (“R&R”) provides such notice and opportunity to respond. See Shivers v. Int’l Bhd. Of Elec. Workers Local Union, 349, 262 Fed. Appx. 121, 125, 127 (11th Cir. Jan. 8, 2008) (indicating that a party has notice of a district court’s intent to sua sponte grant summary judgment where a magistrate judge issues a

## PLAINTIFF'S ALLEGATIONS

Plaintiff originally filed this Complaint in the Middle District of Georgia against Defendants Dr. Niccolo, Warden Stanley Williams, and Commissioner Robert Toole. (Doc. 1.) In his Complaint, Plaintiff asserts that he has been denied adequate medical care. (Id. at p. 4.) Plaintiff does not provide any specifics regarding the medical problems for which he alleges he needs treatment. He makes a conclusory allegation that his lungs hurt, but he also states that doctors have come around to check on him and tell him that he is fine. Id.

## DISCUSSION

### I. Section 1915(g)

28 U.S.C. § 1915(g) of the PLRA provides:

In no event shall a prisoner bring a civil action or appeal a judgment in a civil action or proceeding under this section if the prisoner has, on 3 or more prior occasions, while incarcerated or detained in any facility, brought an action or appeal in a court of the United States that was dismissed on the grounds that it is frivolous, malicious, or fails to state a claim upon which relief may be granted, unless the prisoner is under imminent danger of serious physical injury.

28 U.S.C. § 1915(g). Furthermore, dismissals for providing false filing-history information and failing to comply with court orders both fall under the category of “abuse of the judicial process,” which the Eleventh Circuit has held to be a “strike-worthy” form of dismissal under § 1915(g). See Rivera v. Allin, 144 F.3d 719, 723 (11th Cir. 1998); Malautea v. Suzuki Motor Co., 987 F.2d 1536, 1544 (11th Cir.1993) (characterizing failure to comply with court orders as

---

report recommending the sua sponte granting of summary judgment); Anderson v. Dunbar Armored, Inc., 678 F. Supp. 2d 1280, 1296 (N.D. Ga. 2009) (noting that R&R served as notice that claims would be sua sponte dismissed). This Report and Recommendation constitutes fair notice to Plaintiff that his suit is barred and due to be dismissed. As indicated below, Plaintiff will have the opportunity to present his objections to this finding, and the District Court will review de novo properly submitted objections. See 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1); Fed. R. Civ. P. 72; see also Glover v. Williams, No. 1:12-CV-3562-TWT-JFK, 2012 WL 5930633, at \*1 (N.D. Ga. Oct. 18, 2012) (explaining that magistrate judge’s report and recommendation constituted adequate notice and petitioner’s opportunity to file objections provided a reasonable opportunity to respond).

“abuse of the judicial process”). Section 1915(g) “requires frequent filer prisoners to prepay the entire filing fee before federal courts may consider their lawsuits and appeals.” Rivera, 144 F.3d at 731. The Eleventh Circuit upheld the constitutionality of Section 1915(g) in Rivera. In so doing, the Court concluded that Section 1915(g) does not violate an inmate’s rights to access to the courts, to due process of law, or to equal protection, or the doctrine of separation of powers. Rivera, 144 F.3d at 721–27.

A review of Plaintiff’s history of filings reveals that he has brought at least three civil actions or appeals which were dismissed and count as strikes under Section 1915(g). See: Order Adan v. John and Jane Does “Every man, woman and child”, Case No. 5:15-cv-47 (March 4, 2015) ECF No. 4 (dismissing Plaintiff’s complaint based on three strikes provision and citing three prior cases that qualifies as strikes under Section 1915(g)). Because Plaintiff has filed at least three previously dismissed cases or appeals which qualify as strikes under Section 1915(g), Plaintiff may not proceed *in forma pauperis* in this action unless he can demonstrate that he meets the “imminent danger of serious physical injury” exception to Section 1915(g).

“In order to come within the imminent danger exception, the Eleventh Circuit requires ‘specific allegations of present imminent danger that may result in serious physical harm.’” Odum v. Bryan Cnty. Judicial Circuit, No. CV407-181, 2008 WL 766661, at \*1 (S.D. Ga. Mar. 20, 2008) (quoting Skillern v. Jackson, No. CV606-49, 2006 WL 1687752, at \*2 (S.D. Ga. June 14, 2006) (citing Brown v. Johnson, 387 F.3d 1344, 1349 (11th Cir.2004))). General and conclusory allegations not grounded in specific facts indicating that injury is imminent cannot invoke the Section 1915(g) exception. Margiotti v. Nichols, No. CV306-113, 2006 WL 1174350, at \*2 (N.D. Fla. May 2, 2006). “Additionally, ‘it is clear that a prisoner cannot create the imminent danger so as to escape the three strikes provision of the PLRA.’” Ball v. Allen,

No. 06-0496, 2007 WL 484547, at \*2 (S.D. Ala. Feb. 8, 2007) (citing Muhammad v. McDonough, No. CV306-527-J-32, 2006 WL 1640128, at \*1 (M.D. Fla. June 9, 2006)).

Plaintiff should not be excused from prepaying the filing fee because of the imminent danger of serious physical injury. His Complaint does not even list his alleged medical needs much less provide specific details of how those needs pose an imminent risk of danger. Rather, Plaintiff's Complaint is a quintessential example of the conclusory allegations that fail to meet the imminent danger exception to the three strikes rule. Moreover, his Complaint refutes any concern that he is in danger of not receiving any medical treatment as he states that doctors "come around" and check on him. (Doc. 1, p. 4.) Therefore, Section 1915(g) bars him from proceeding *in forma pauperis* in this case. Should Plaintiff choose to prosecute these claims while incarcerated, he must bring a separate action and pay the full filing fee.

## **II. Leave to Appeal *In Forma Pauperis***

The Court should also deny Plaintiff leave to appeal *in forma pauperis*.<sup>2</sup> Though Plaintiff has, of course, not yet filed a notice of appeal, it would be appropriate to address these issues in the Court's order of dismissal. Fed. R. App. P. 24(a)(3) (trial court may certify that appeal is not taken in good faith "before or after the notice of appeal is filed").

An appeal cannot be taken *in forma pauperis* if the trial court certifies that the appeal is not taken in good faith. 28 U.S.C. § 1915(a)(3); Fed. R. App. P. 24(a)(3). Good faith in this context must be judged by an objective standard. Busch v. Cty. of Volusia, 189 F.R.D. 687, 691 (M.D. Fla. 1999). A party does not proceed in good faith when he seeks to advance a frivolous claim or argument. See Coppedge v. United States, 369 U.S. 438, 445 (1962). A claim or argument is frivolous when it appears the factual allegations are clearly baseless or the legal theories are indisputably meritless. Neitzke v. Williams, 490 U.S. 319, 327 (1989); Carroll v.

---

<sup>2</sup> A certificate of appealability is not required in this Section 1983 action.

Gross, 984 F.2d 392, 393 (11th Cir. 1993). Or, stated another way, an *in forma pauperis* action is frivolous and, thus, not brought in good faith, if it is “without arguable merit either in law or fact.” Napier v. Preslicka, 314 F.3d 528, 531 (11th Cir. 2002); see also Brown v. United States, Nos. 407CV085, 403CR001, 2009 WL 307872, at \*1–2 (S.D. Ga. Feb. 9, 2009).

Based on the above analysis of Plaintiff’s action, there are no non-frivolous issues to raise on appeal, and an appeal would not be taken in good faith. Moreover, as a “three striker” Plaintiff is not only barred from filing a civil action *in forma pauperis*, he is also barred from filing an appeal *in forma pauperis* while he is a prisoner. Thus, the Court should deny him *in forma pauperis* status on appeal.

#### CONCLUSION

For the foregoing reasons, the Court **VACATES** its Order dated June 12, 2015, (doc. 9), and **DENIES** Plaintiff’s Motions to Proceed *In Forma Pauperis*, (doc. 8). Further, I **RECOMMEND** that Plaintiff’s Complaint, (doc. 1), be **DISMISSED** without prejudice and that Plaintiff be denied leave to appeal *in forma pauperis*.

Any party seeking to object to this Report and Recommendation is **ORDERED** to file specific written objections within fourteen (14) days of the date on which this Report and Recommendation is entered. Any objections asserting that the Magistrate Judge failed to address any contention raised in the Complaint must also be included. Failure to do so will bar any later challenge or review of the factual findings or legal conclusions of the Magistrate Judge. See 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(C); Thomas v. Arn, 474 U.S. 140 (1985). A copy of the objections must be served upon all other parties to the action.

Upon receipt of objections meeting the specificity requirement set out above, a United States District Judge will make a *de novo* determination of those portions of the report to which

objection are made and may accept, reject, or modify in whole or in part, the findings or recommendations made by the Magistrate Judge. Objections not meeting the specificity requirement set out above will not be considered by a District Judge. The Clerk of Court is **DIRECTED** to serve a copy of this Report and Recommendation upon Plaintiff.

**SO ORDERED** and **REPORTED** and **RECOMMENDED**, this 8th day of January, 2016.



---

R. STAN BAKER  
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE  
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF GEORGIA